

BUILDING DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
Minutes of May 15, 2012 Meeting

Jon Morris opened the Building-Development Commission (BDC) meeting at **3:08 p.m. on Tuesday, May 15, 2012.**

Present: Bernice Cutler, Harry Sherrill, Travis Haston, Jon Morris, Zeke Acosta, John Taylor, Rob Belisle, Kevin Silva, Elliot Mann and John Wood

Absent: Tim West, Ed Horne and Hal Hester

1. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The motion by Travis Haston seconded by Zeke Acosta to approve the April 17th, 2012 meeting minutes passed unanimously.

2. BDC MEMBER ISSUES AND COMMENTS

Elliot Mann commented that he appreciated the RDS Turn-Around Times being on the agenda. There is obviously some concern in the industry. Thanked Jim for being proactive in getting the correspondence out there since there is concern out there. Second is something that came up in the consistency meeting last month looking at trying to come up with an easier way to get utilities on homes under construction. There are a lot of municipalities that once you get your final electrical and your final mechanical the meters can automatically get installed. I know here we hold it till we have full CO. We have the new energy code out there and a lot of things with Energy Star and a lot of the testing that needs to happen with mechanical systems definitely made a better finished product. I'd like to recommend that we find an easier process to get that done.

Bernice Cutler thanked Patrick Granson and his staff for our first multi-family second round express review and it went really well. Thank you for a great job.

3. PUBLIC ATTENDEE ISSUES AND COMMENTS

No public attendee comments.

4. CSS SURVEY REPORT

Ed Gagnon walked through the handout that was distributed (see attached). Representing one page summary of a 120 page report describes what we did. Overall response rate was great at 17% response rate that was well up from 2 years ago. The inspections and professionals were up significantly, 32%, 1/3 of all surveys that went out to inspections contacts were returned. There was an enormous response rate for the trades. The one survey we had a low response rate was the over site survey. We were down 4%. The amount of new development that has been going on for the last couple of years has not been as high as it has been in the past. The number of email addresses we had to correspond to those folks on the oversight survey was much less than the other two surveys. Our response level was low. Results in the second section; professional survey results from that grade, vast majority of the numbers from the architects and engineers were up. The respondents gave a tremendous amount of detail as well. And the comments sections on process improvements changes and suggestions or web changes and suggestions as well. Example they noted information about EPM and Posse and CTAC and how there are redundancies in data entered on appendix b versus some of the other information on line and OnSchedule. A lot of different areas process wise web wise that were addressed in the comments from the professional survey so there a lot of opportunities for improvement there. Over site ratings were up for some of the customer service related indicators, down a bit for the web indicators and the inspections survey was the one survey where we saw drops in several of the ratings and that was the one survey we had an area for concern. Downward trends included being notified that the inspector was coming on site responding to and returning phone calls as well, some of those numbers went down there was a lack of awareness of some of the customer service programs like NotifyMe, web site program, telephone numbers, some of those different areas so there are several different places where the numbers were down. One point that was brought up when we did a review meeting with the management group here was the survey we took last time was just before the RIF happened 2 years ago and so maybe the staffing levels may have been higher during the survey period in 2010 than they have been at this point. A lot of the actual respondents were alluding to the fact that your staffing levels are further down and they

convey concern with responsiveness. Coupled with that in this particular survey we have the most aggressive expectation from the trades in terms of how quickly they are going to get a call back. More than 1/3 of the folks when they leave a message expect a call back in 30 minutes. to 2 hours which is the highest it's ever been. So if there are more staffing constraints than there were 2 years ago and expectations are getting more aggressive in terms of timeliness then those types of factors combined I see some of the ratings going down for the inspections survey. We did have a couple of new areas of focus for this survey we want to get some feedback from the reorganization, we got some of that information, we asked about the project managers as well and actually the project managers got significantly high ratings. If you were to look at the project manager ratings on a 5 point scale, they averaged about 3.9 which are the 2nd highest of all the attributes we were evaluating. The agreement section where the respondents are asked to say how much do you agree with this positive statement about the county. Project managers when they were utilized were generally rated fairly high. We also looked at the awareness of the customer service options that I mentioned and there were some awareness issues there that the management team is aware of at this point. The last section in terms of recommendations from the inspection standpoint there are several areas that need to be addressed both in terms of increasing awareness of the customer service options. Turnaround time for returning phone calls and other points relating to communicating with the customer about the estimated time of arrival, contact information when the inspectors are coming on site. If there is an issue, the subs know who they can contact and how to contact them if they are not able to meet them on the site. There were several references made to being denied because of access; where we failed because of access/communication prior to the inspector getting on site is noted as something that needed to be improved. Plan review and permitting customers, looking at the web and process oriented recommendations they provided in the survey. Some points about billing and payment review were noted enough in some of the ratings have dropped in the ease of which I can make payment for the inspections so that's an area of focus as well. General stat recommendations as we always do relating to continuing to work on timeliness, continue to focus on making it as easy as possible for people to get in touch for the person they need to get in touch with when they do call. Even if those rating are improving, timeliness and the ability to get in touch with the person when I need them are always the two biggest areas of focus on all the surveys. Again, I have reviewed the full survey with the management team and they have a lot more detail than this.

EM: Jim, what's your general opinion?

JB: Obviously we are still digesting; it is not a small report. We are very pleased with the response rate; it's a very high response rate. We think we understand why the over site is down. But in terms of what we are going to do next, we're going to look closely at the inspection data to determine what the concerns are and compare to hard data we have on inspection response time, customer notification percents and things like that. Then we'll determine inside that set of concerns what's valid we can go after. The "reach the right person quickly" puzzles us because we work on that hard. For those of you that are around or in my office next door is the mint hill conference room and posted on the mint hill conference room is a list of outcomes and challenges for our work plan for the year. You'll see that there are 4 things in there that came out of his last report and this is one of them so we've been working on it and will go through this report to determine what we are missing or not doing right or what else we can do on that as well as we will sift through the open ended comments at the end which are probably the hardest ones to go through. You really have to have thick skin to go through the open ended comments because usually when someone makes a comment they are not making a comment to tell you did a great job. But comments that show up enough then there's probably something there that we have to go after and try to figure out what it is. That is generally the approach we will take, same as last time. We're puzzled by why the inspection responses would be harsher than they were last time because the service that we are providing, we think, on that side is better and more kindly if you take into account the changes that we've had to make in staffing than 2 years ago, but as Ed pointed out the survey was before the RIF and they were seeing an unusually high level of service since we were overstaffed.

JM: Does it make sense to reach out to 5 John Taylors and the 5 Harrys and the 5 Zekes that use your service, to get 10-15 customers in a room and say here are the 3 or 4 issues that keep coming up, you're the users of our service, what are we missing here. We do a customer service survey for our 200 tenants every year as well. And it can be frustrating, but then we do a luncheon where we sit down with those tenants and our views are always

security and lighting is what people always complain about. You get some great ideas when you get the people working from the outside in. When you see things coming again and again we get lighting and security every year, it can start to get a little frustrating because you are trying to make things brighter and safer.

JB: What I hear you suggesting is putting together a focus group to help us understand the survey

JM: Yes from outside in.

EM: For at least a few specific areas where you are doing things you think to better those issues.

JB: Try and distill first what we think what we think is being said in there and then ask them to help us understand what we are missing or what we can do better. An example is reaching the right person quickly; we've been working on that hard. We're not sure if they are going through the 311 system and then they get lost or what. We'd be happy to.

EM: Is there any way to decipher where comments are coming from? A/E?

JB: It is put together in a package to look at it globally but he's got it sliced and diced so you can tell what the A/E responses are in different areas and what their comments are for contractors as well as oversight.

I like the idea of a focus group, let Patrick, Gene and I digest that and try to determine how we might do that.

JM: Do you know the 10 or 15 customers that use your system a lot and are going to give you candid feedback, sit down and talk with those people, maybe not one on one but.

EM: My fear is that 10 or 15 knows the system they know who to contact.

JB: It sounds like it's easy. What we need to do is get a group that's a true cross-section of customers big and small that use it often and use it frequently. That's the way that you find out what everybody is seeing and almost all the groups that's what we've tried to do sometimes successfully, sometimes not so.

TH: You are only talking about reviewing the feedback and the comments of problems and then presenting the pool of topics. You can't just say it's an open forum, tell me your problem on a certain topic. That gets messy.

JB: A lot of times when we do exercises, the 2 questions that we ask is what are we doing that keeps you from doing your work and if you were king/queen, what would you do differently in our process. That gets people to empty their brain. We're not afraid of taking approach but I don't think that is what we are after here. Before we can start that; we have to digest it, come back to Ed go over it and say these are things we think it makes sense for us to discuss in greater depth with a select group of customers, see if he agrees with it and then try and construct what we think would be a good group and come back with a recommendation for you on how to move forward. This is not something that we take lightly and we think we are going to put away in 2 weeks, some of these things in the last report we have been working on for 2 years.

JM: I like that, sort of a focus group of questions and a select group of people getting beyond the Rodgers that knows the system so well into that next tier.

JB: Given what they said they'd like to do next, if I came back to you with some ideas that Patrick, Gene and I have after talking with other management team members of what we think would make sense for us to discuss with a select group of customers, could you help react to that and tell us how close we are?

EG: I know that some of what you had mentioned right at the start was looking at some internal data in a little bit more depth, when are calls coming in, reasons; if you honing in on where trends were bad or where we're doing poorly compared to some of the other attributes and you have some internal data and you have some focus group data to dig into the root cause then you can be much more comfortable in saying this is what we should do about it to improve upon it. We do on each one of the surveys ask would you be interested in / or would you like someone from the county to contact you so you have a list of people who have voiced an interest just through the survey and having a dialogue so that could also be a source of people to participate in the focus group.

5. RDS TURNAROUND TIMES

Jim Bartl described that the RDS turnaround times relates to a letter that we sent to customers on May 7th, 2012. We did this to make them aware of our turnaround time goal in residential drawing submittal on three fronts; the custom submittals, the master plan submittals and the townhouses. We have a 5 day goal on the custom reviews. We had used that goal as a hard goal for those submittals and a softer goal for other submittals. For example, Master Plan is big, 100's of sheets, so we've said that is flexible. Depending on which program or component

you are talking about we are anywhere between 8 – 14 days beyond the 5 day goal. We know that is a concern to the industry and we are paying attention to it. It is something we typically deal with in a code change cycle. It is not the first time we have come up against it. This is probably the most extreme and there are a couple of reasons for that. On the technical side, this is probably the biggest change in the code since 2002 with all the changes we have put in place and that is a challenge for us; it's a challenge for customers; and for us to get proficient in working with the new set of requirements with customers getting the right information down on a plan. We are going slower than we typically would. The second thing is that in the past when we've run into these we've been deep on resources. The past was when we were fully staffed. When you reach into a group of 60 inspectors trying to get help, it's a lot different than reaching into a group of 120 inspectors for help. That's one of the things that has been slowing us down. None the less, the steps we've been taking to attack the problem is that Patrick and Tim went through the necessary HR paperwork (which is taking us longer than it used to) to add 2 part time plan reviewers which we'll bring on and keep them on as long as we have to kill this problem.

EM: When will they start?

JB: We just received the numbers last week, posted for 8 days and we'll close it Monday. You should be able to pick folks and come to an agreement pretty quick, so probably 2 weeks we can get those resources on board. It's not incredibly fast. The one thing we did right away was took 2 field inspectors and moved them from the field to the office and they have been working full time on plan reviews. They can work on the paper reviews. We get a mix of paper and electronic and that's the kind of thing when we bring inspectors out of the field that they can attack because they don't have to worry about coming up to speed on the electronic medium. Part timers are going to have to come up to speed on it. We've been trying to bring in some overtime hours from other field inspectors, and one of the things we've been doing which we feel is necessary in this case is Tim has managed both the RTAC and CTAC from a standpoint of when a customer calls or walks in we take care of them. It's kind of all hands on; if you are working on a review but you are the only person available, you are going to take it. You can imagine that fractures your time to be able to focus on reviews. What we said we are going to do is that we are going to take one position and focus it on phone calls. We are going to take one position and focus it on the walk-ins and if that means the stuff queue's up somewhat then so be it because that allows us to take 3 people and focus them on the reviews to stay concentrated. We think we have to do that for awhile, not sure how long but that is the plan. We think all of those things together we'll be able to get our arms around the problem by the end of June.

EM: Is it getting worse or getting better at this point?

TT: It's getting better on the paper side because I can utilize more resources.

EM: I heard on the street you are better off bringing in a paper plan because it'll get done a lot quicker than an electronic.

TT: Correct. During this week on the paper side we've gone from being 15 days out down to 6 days out with that additional help.

EM: Are there other resources that we can put towards it? I know from our particular circumstance that I think it's the same with a lot. Everybody got jammed up with their own engineers and all these are backed up trying to get plans restamped, I don't think we've seen a full wave come through yet is my concern. And with the unique circumstance with the code rolling out the way it did and nobody having information until after the date had already passed.

JB: I think we can all agree that the way the code was rolled out was not ideal. The 4 steps that I pointed out; we've kind of wrung our brain on what we can do. And we are going to work that really hard. This gets into the issue that I've been concerned about for awhile that I discussed with the management team and I discussed candidly with the BDC Budget Subcommittee through the budget discussions last years, and that is that one of the big things we lost in the RIF (not trying to point a finger) just trying to point out an issue. One of the big things we lost was on our plan review side we used to call our D-Team in commercial; we had inspectors that would come in and help us on over time on the residential side and we had a lot of part time resources whether they were retirees or they were people from other jurisdictions and they made up a considerable part of our staff. Depending on how you look at the numbers and depending on which segment of the work you were looking at could be 8 – 9% running up as high as 15%. The first thing we did on October 2nd of 2008 was we shut all that

off. Now we have to rebuild that capacity; we didn't build that overnight we built that over years and now we have to rebuild it and it is going to take us awhile. I think that's a compounding thing. This is symptomatic to the larger problem. And in the budget we addressed by adding money; so we are going after rebuilding it. One thing that we've all discussed candidly in the office is that it is more difficult to bring people on now than we thought it was going to be. It isn't about being able to find the people; although it's harder than you'd think; it's that now we are starting to bring people back that are 2 sometimes 3 years removed from the code, it's not the same code anymore and if you think about all the changes that we've put in place on the process, it's not the same process anymore. What I've argued with managers is that it doesn't make any difference anymore if you hire somebody from Meck County or from Cabarrus or Wake or others because the process has changed and the code has changed. It's not a perfect storm of problems but it's challenging. I think from your perspective it has our attention and we are working on it. If we think of some other resource we'll go after it.

EM: So it's not a capital issue, it's not a lack of money. If somebody wanted to throw money at it, meaning pay a premium to get something through quicker; you wouldn't have the resources to help with it anyway.

JB: I think that's correct. It is not a money issue. We're close enough to the end of the year that we could leg it out on the money side and once we get into next year we have plenty of money budgeted on this side. That is not the issue. The issue is just having the resources to do it in a point in time that is peculiar because the change in the code. It's exactly the kind of thing when we had contract, part time and 3rd party resources built over years to help us digest and we're having trouble rebuilding it.

EM: One last question, I think everybody is learning the code and interoperating it as we go, are you seeing the failure rate increasing right now, things getting turned in and having to process multiple times and is there a list of commonly seen items that we can be getting out to the industry so maybe we could stop some of that?

TT: Our biggest common denominator right now is submittals that have not been looked at; they are still referencing previous code cycles. They are pretty minor things if designers would proof their stuff before they submit; that would take a huge burden off us.

EM: Because when that happens it gets kicked to the back of the line and starts over.

PG: If they are not reviewing the product that comes in for the 2012, and it even says 2009 on it, they are just throwing it in the hopper to see what happens, in my opinion.

JB: We'll get it under control; it's just going to take awhile and going to take some patience on the customer's part.

JM: I think if you are prioritizing these things so you've got these customers issues, what I would tell you about from the commercial side is to provide a premium level service for a premium price. We've got a project that is important and we are willing to pay for it. Have the resources in place so that we can get it through. I know that is not something you can do next week but as we are looking 3-6-12 months out.

JB: That's a good point Jon and we have always provided on the commercial side a wide range of premium services and they've been heavily used. We've made programs like that available on the residential side but they have almost never been used. We've had express review on residential and I don't think it's ever been used and when we designed it Bob Dulin and I designed it back in 1999 and it was never used. On the commercial side has a program called professional certification that is used on a very limited basis and the residential side has something similar and I think there is only one entity that uses it. We have tried to make some of those available but they haven't been widely used. One of the reasons they haven't been widely used is because 5 days is a very aggressive goal. If you call around to other large authorities, Greensboro, Raleigh, you are going to be hard pressed to find authorities that can push the work out that fast. I think it's been such an aggressive goal that they haven't needed that service in residential which is fine except when we get in a situation like this we don't have the horses. We're happy to do something like that.

EM: If they are willing to pay for it is this something they can bring their professional in, marked as noted and walk out with the permit?

JB: The fastest service would be if we opened up a third party contract line if they wanted to use it. Similar to what we did at Northlake and could talk about whether Barry could do that.

TT: The professional certification program takes awhile to get it set up.

EM: That takes too long; I'm referring to the Express Review side.

PG: We could map it out we're still back to the window of resources and then we could talk about resources but hand in hand good enough for the expectations of the customer and the field, you can throw the people at it but you want to give the customers a good product making sure you do the best job you can

JB: What if we looked at this the way we look at the Northlake Mall. What if we found somebody we could contract with that we set it up and if they want to get in that stream they can and they have to pay the premium to have the review done in that stream and we'd have the contract set up; they'd have to enter the contract on our side and we'd connect the people. I'm afraid the cost of it would make most builders choke.

EM: What do you think?

JB: It's been a long time since I've looked at what we did on Northlake Mall but it wasn't cheap. If you think that has the potential to have legs we could study it.

EM: Especially if you were looking at something maybe more for a master plan type setup where they want to get started and it's all getting held up.

TH: If the residential contractors which is the majority of who submits the application for permit; if they're not using express review; why do we need that as a service? We're just talking about another avenue; correct?

JB: What Patrick was saying is you can talk about using express review but it gets back to the issue of where do we get the resources. What a third party contract would do is we'd bring in an outside resource. It is shifting the problems from one part of the line to the other with us not adding resources to handle this.

EM: When you take the resources off, you are slowing down the line that's paying the normal price and you are putting the resources towards a premium price.

JB: And that is something we've always said we don't want to do. And if you said to use the overtime to do it; but right now we are using the overtime to beat down backlog.

RB: How many of your first time submittals get kicked back because of mistakes on the designer's end?

PG: We have a pass rate around 60 – 70%. There are some projects in certain channels that are turned down a lot more. Master plans are turned down 60% of the time and the reason why is their product has a lot of options, they have a lot of models and modules they use and you have to go through all those when they haven't went through the product and their product doesn't show the 2012 new code changes.

RB: Is there a mechanism to cause them pain for their stupidity?

PG: There is no penalty, you get back in line again depending on the length of comments and how good you did and the comments you have that's how long you have to take to reroute and when it's a master project it's pretty intense because there is a lot of different modules and components that they tried to use. It takes much longer to do a master plan and a townhouse project is not simple either.

JB: The paying programs have done design in areas where there were a group of customers who are persistent in submitting things that didn't comply. When I refer to consistent, my reference is trends over years. For instance when we started the work on the Architect Engineer pass rates through service changes we worked on with the architects in 2000 and 2001 we slowly improved the pass rate to 50% and it backslid to 45% around 2007 and that's when the BDC asked us to work on it some more. You are looking at years that we studied it. This is a problem that is caused by a defined set of things over a short period of time, code change, trying to rebuild our staff back up. When we managed to improve the A/E pass rates to 50% and it fell back to 45% that's what lead us to eventually develop the pass rate incentive program that pushed us all the way up to 75 and 80%. It's a very heavy duty program, took us a long time to design but was aimed after a wide group of professionals that couldn't get serious their work until we announced the program in which point they got real serious about their work. It wasn't something that happened over 3 months; over a decade we struggled with this problem. I'm not sure it's the right tool for this problem, not that I'm not happy to talk about it we certainly can talk about it. This program took a whole lot of work to design, forget the technical programming they are complicated programs. I think the simplest fastest solution might be for us to be is there a way for us to create a 3rd party team if it is that important to them, from a money perspective, here's the stream and you can get in it. If not we are working very hard to get the rest of the regular service back to where it works for you.

EM: It would be worth exploring at least to see what it is; it gives people an option.

JB: We're happy to talk about it, are there disincentive tools that should be created to help keep this in line but I think before we get off on that the time consuming study, not just on our part but on the industries part that

contributes to these things, I think that we should wait to see if it is an aberration that has to do with the code change and our staffing issue which I think it is or is it something that is more drawn out. If we're sitting a year from now and we still have the same problem, I think you folks would be the first one to walk in the door and say what's holding up the line.

RB: With such a high failure rate it's not your responsibility to make sure they are using the right building code when you receive a set of plans. Then you have to put it back in the queue and the industry gets all riled up.

EM: That's why I was asking if there were certain common items.

RB: Maybe because my business is similar to code inspection and I go out to a job site and the rebar is wrong and they know it's wrong but have me come out there anyway so they can catch it and tell them how to fix it, I know that's not their job to put it out there for you to say it's wrong and give it back to you to do it again.

BC: Is there a gate keeping list?

JB: There is a submittal requirements summary but we don't gate it. The assumption is that we make the list; it's in your interest to use it. It is entirely different from the commercial side it's designed to be simple slick and get the stuff through. We started residential submittal in 1999, 13 years ago. For 12 years and 9 months of the 13 years its worked great. If we go further down the road and you feel it makes sense to focus on disincentives we can.

EM: We're going to need to hear some of that feedback from you guys, because we don't see it, we need to know from your part the habitual violators that are clogging up the system, at that point we need to figure out what to do.

JB: The typical way we do it is we collect quarterly data, sit down with the industry and ask how bad you think this is. We can tell you what we think about it and if everyone agrees it's bad enough to go after. We work on this problem in 6 – 9 months we come back and look at the data to see if it is back in shape and if not do we need to put together a group to work with us to try and see if it is bad enough that it merits some type of program to go after the issues. It was never intended to be something that was a high tech/heavy duty; it was designed to get in, have the review done and get it out. CTAC is very much the brain child of RDS. That's one of the tricks we've had to get CTAC automated; it is entirely different from OnSchedule and Mega, it doesn't have all the heavy duty under pinning, it doesn't grade people, it doesn't have the disincentives. The incentive is you should be ready to go for your permit bring it in; we'll review it and get it out of here. We know what we have to do on this one.

6. COMMERCIAL PRELIMINARY PLAN REVIEW

Patrick Granson shared that Commercial Preliminary Plan Review final schedule of changes; we met back in November/December, went through our process and want to discuss a little about new changes. Those changes were to help be more productive in the preliminary review process for the customer and the staff. This will address a problem with some AE's that did not provide any written code analysis or Appendix B for the project and the staff was kind of pinned between them trying to walk through their project. The customer had an expectation of going through the project with little or no information. We met February 13th and agreed on the following policy changes:

- a) Revise the OnSchedule preliminary review policy, requiring written code analysis submittal along with Appendix B, 48 hours in advance of meeting.
- b) Incomplete or no submittal results in canceling appointment.
- c) Re-write of Department instructions on preliminary reviews to match this, and emphasize AE preparation.

Currently we offer informal and formal reviews. What this would do is make all preliminary review projects, they will have to upload the information so that we can review it, give them some feedback and when they show up it would be more productive in the review process. That is the changes in the policy that we should have implemented within a month or so.

BC: Is there any penalty when canceled if they don't have their documents uploaded within 48 hours.

PG: No. We do have pool projects that come in that are less than an hour, so we want to schedule them and every hour counts for us but we do average quite a bit of pool projects that are less than one hour that a lot of people don't know, they set in a pool to get complete.

7. MECK-SI REVISIONS

Patrick discussed the Meck-SI changes. He thanked Jeff, Lon, Melanie, Chuck, Wendell for their work. We met and discussed the changes in the 2012 for the Special Inspection requirements in Chapter 17. We revised the documents, went back through the web pages trying to bring them more current in 2012. In our review we noticed that some of our web site designs are somewhat out of date. We had a twofold approach; the first one is to address all the new code changes. The next part will be a focus group that Wendell Dixon will lead. We'll bring some people in that use Meck-SI and give us some feedback on what they think of the operations and see if we need to enhance that for either operations, functionality or even staff input. We are moving forward with that. We've also hired a third party to work through our out of date brochures to more accurately reflect what the service entails.

8. DEPARTMENT STATISTICS AND INITIATIVES REPORT

Statistics Report

Permit Revenue

- April permit (only) revenue- \$1,155,078, compares to March revenue of \$1,435,293.
- FY12 budget projected monthly permit revenue; $\$12,127,032/12 = \$1,000,083 \times 10 = \$10,000,830$
- At 4/30/12, YTD permit rev of \$12,809,874 is above permit fee rev projection by \$2.704M, or 27%+.

Construction Value of Permits Issued

- April total - \$179,732,019, with YTD amount \$2,272,964,379; vs. FY11 Total at April – \$1.299M
- So YTD figure is approximately 974M or 75% above construction value permitted YTD at April, 2011

Permits Issued:

	March	April	3 Month Trend
Residential	4010	3529	2854/2845/4010/3529
Commercial	2576	2646	2402/2319/2576/2646
Other (Fire/Zone)	561	504	399/499/561504
Total	7147	6679	5655/5656/7147/6679

- Residential down 12%__; commercial up 2.7%__; total down 6.55%
- SF detached new construction permits YTD at 1807 vs. 1545 at 4/30/11, so up 17%-

Inspection Activity: Inspections Performed

Insp. Req.	Mar	April	Insp. Perf.	Mar	April	% Change
Bldg.	4478	4512	Bldg.	4417	4467	+1.1%
Elec.	5142	5309	Elec.	5130	5252	+2.37%
Mech.	2921	2969	Mech.	2935	2950	+0.5%
Plbg.	2243	2217	Plbg.	2211	2209	Same-
Total	14,784	15,007	Total	14,593	14,878	+2%

- Mech and Plbg about the same as March; Bldg up 1%, Elec up 2%+ from March totals
- Overall average inspections performed counts up 2%
- Inspections performed were 99.14% of inspections requested

Inspection Activity: Inspections Response Time

Insp. Resp. Time	OnTime %		Total % After 24 Hrs. Late		Total % After 48 Hrs. Late		Average Resp. in Days	
	Mar	April	Mar	April	Mar	April	Mar	April
Bldg.	95.8	92.9	97.4	94.8	99.3	98.4	1.08	1.14
Elec.	93.8	91.3	94.6	92.4	99.3	98.0	1.12	1.19
Mech.	93.5	93.8	95.0	95.3	99.2	97.9	1.12	1.13
Plbg.	98.6	94.6	98.8	94.9	99.9	99.1	1.03	1.11
Total	95.1	92.8	96.1	94.1	99.4	98.3	1.10	1.15

- All trades down somewhat; Mech down ½%, Bldg & Elec down 2.5-3%, Plbg down 4%
- Overall average position down about 2%, but still well above 85-90% goal range

Inspection Pass Rates for April, 2012

OVERALL MONTHLY AV'G @ 86.09%, compared to 85.54% in March

Bldg: Mar. – 79.16%
 April – 80.82%

Elec: Mar. – 84.45%
 April – 84.72%

Mech: Mar. – 88.71%
 April – 89.22%

Plbg: Mar. – 92.78%
 April – 92.37%

- Bldg and Mech up .5-1.5%; Elec up <.5%; Plbg down <.5%

CFD Proposes Discontinuing Inspection Pass Rate Report

- Different service approach: CFD inspectors make numerous site visits on most projects (called spot checks in their system) that are not "pass / fail inspections". They are recorded as satisfactory or unsatisfactory based on the work done at that point.
 - By conducting spot checks, CFD tracks the project throughout construction to hopefully eliminate surprises. CFD also thinks yields a higher first CO inspection pass rate.
- This is not a readily accessible report for CFD, so it takes a disproportionate amount of time to prepare (relative to other reports).
- CFD reported this number to the BDC for over two years.
 - From Dec. 2010 to Nov 2011, the average inspection pass rate was 77.54%, with a high of 82% and a low of 73%. Those numbers roughly approximate CFD's work on a continuing basis.

OnSchedule and CTAC Numbers for April, 2012

CTAC:

- 106 first reviews
- Projects approval rate (pass/fail) – 76%
- CTAC was 45% of OnSch (*) first review volume (106/106+127 = 233) = 55.6%
 *CTAC as a % of OnSch is based on the total of only scheduled and Express projects

OnSchedule:

- June, 10: 153 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 89.71% all trades, 91.59% B/E/M/P only
- July, 10: 140 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 87% all trades, 90% B/E/M/P only

- August, 10: 159 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 87% all trades, 90% B/E/M/P only
- September, 10: 148 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 85% all trades, 83% B/E/M/P only
- October, 10: 158- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 92% all trades, 90% B/E/M/P only
- November, 10: 154- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 94% all trades, 94.25% B/E/M/P only
- December, 10: 149- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 74.5% all trades, 80% B/E/M/P only
- January, 11: 137- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 82.65% all trades, 83.5% B/E/M/P only
- February, 11: 136- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 86.6% all trades, 88% B/E/M/P only
- March, 11: 185 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 85.75% all trades, 84.5% B/E/M/P only
- April, 11: 147- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 78.37% all trades, 84.8% B/E/M/P only
- May, 11: 196- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 98.5% all trades, 85.5% B/E/M/P only
- June, 11: 251- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95.5% all trades, 94.2% B/E/M/P only
- July, 11: 175- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 92.25% all trades, 93.75% B/E/M/P only
- August, 11: 238- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95% all trades, 94.75% B/E/M/P only
- Sept, 11: 219 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95.25% all trades, 96.5% B/E/M/P only
- October, 11:176-1st rev'w projects; on time/early–96.75% all trades, 96.25% B/E/M/P only
- November, 11:184 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–91.75% all trades, 93.25% B/E/M/P only
- December, 11:143 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–95% all trades, 96% B/E/M/P only
- January, 2012:136 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–78% all trades, 87% B/E/M/P only
- February, 12:139 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–74.88% all trades, 73% B/E/M/P only
- March, 12:127 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–86.25% all trades, 87% B/E/M/P only
- April, 12:151 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–92.25% all trades, 95% B/E/M/P only

Notes regarding on time / early

- BEMP back well above target
- All disciplines overall average above target as well.
- Will continue to closely monitor, ass all reviewers get their sea legs on EPS-EPR.

Booking Lead Times

- OnSchedule Projects: **for reporting chart posted on line**, on April 30, 2012, showed
 - 1-2 hr projects; at 2 work day booking lead, except Bldg at 6, CLT Zoning at 5, &Health at 8 days.
 - 3-4 hour projects; at 2-4 work days lead time, except M/P at 9, Bldg at 11 and CLT Zoning & Health at 11 days.
 - 5-8 hour projects; at 3-4 work days lead time, except M/P at 9, Bldg at 1, CFD at 8, CMUD at 13, and CLT Zoning & Health at 11 days.
- CTAC plan review turnaround time; 2-3 days, except Bldg at 8 days
- Express Review – booking lead time was; 6 work days for small projects, 7 work days for large

8.2. Status Report on Various Department Initiatives

April Meeting Follow-up

LUESA Fee Ordinance Changes

The LUESA Fee Ordinance Change was presented by the Department and Cary Saul to the BOCC on Tuesday, May 1st, it wasn't down for a vote, it was to make them aware of it and to receive any questions that they had. They will likely vote on this and approve it on June 5th as part of the FY13 budget process. Jon Morris gets an award for the great job he did in explaining the BDC's thinking to the board.

BDC Quarterly Bulletin

Received comments from Jon today; JB approved it and it's loaded now then out to customers.

CRWG Subcommittee Work

The subcommittee met on May 1st. They will meet again on Friday at 10:00 a.m. They are focusing on three items:

- Item 1 regards 'note d' incorporating 'Upfit Construction Permit Value Calculator' into the permit fee calculation process. Need to develop/agree on a formula.
- Item #5, regarding the cost of incremental service in field inspections, developing inspection limit counts.
- Item #18, regarding "owner as contractor" added inspections, developing inspection limit counts

The plan is to make final recommendations in June depending on how the next two meetings go.

CRWG Public Information Plan (for use if/after BOCC approves the RFBA on June 5)

Assuming the board approves on June 5th we'll get the wheels rolling on it June 6th. It's going to hit key issues such as emphasizing Jon Morris' sound byte that he gave us in a previous meeting, as well as reviewing the various changes, Meck-SI; Equipment Cost; Inspection Allocations; Multi-Trade Inspections and we will use email blasts through NotifyMe with a department public announcement in the can ready to go out. We've developed a slideshow on the web that walks customers through what we are changing and why. That will be linked to the notifications that we send out and we'll also have it running on the lobby. We are paying attention to how we get the word out on it. We'll also link customers to the CRWG final report; the task force that generated all the changes that is loaded on the web now. That is in place and ready to go.

8.2.2. Other

State of Department Address May 23

The state of the department address is a week from tomorrow morning at 7:00 a.m. you are all invited. This is the 16th annual and we present this once a year. You can have refreshments with staff and listen to the overview of the things that we have accomplished in the last year; not everything but just the key items and the issues we will wrestle with in the coming year. You are all welcome.

Electronic Copies for BDC

Rebecca Simcox asked the members if they preferred their BDC package electronically, to be able to go to the web to pull up the package or do you prefer receiving the paper copies. BC digital, HS paper; Jim shared that there is two ways we can provide this. We can send electronic copies to all and assume that you run your own copies and bring them with you or we can send electronic copies and the people that specifically want paper copies we can provide them at your seat or we can send electronic copies and assume everyone still wants paper. That's what we are asking you. Elliot suggested that all receive the electronic copies and those that want paper to let Rebecca know. So far the folks wanting paper in addition to the electronic copies are RB, HS, EM, TH and KS. Going forward the E-package will be loaded on the BDC web page.

Small Project Lead Contractor List

Gene Morton shared that in 1999 we began the process of creating incentives/disincentives for contractors to increase their pass rates. We began creating a recap sheet at the end of the project with the CO issued and adjustment for the final fees for a particular project. We started that process with new construction projects that were getting Certificates of Occupancies, from there we pushed it down to all types of projects that included a general contractor that was still someone involved in managing the project that would be responsible for coordinating some of the work to ensure access was provided when it needed to be available and that worked properly, we're now in the process of pushing it down to some of the smallest of projects to include the change-out contractors they are doing change outs where you may have a mechanical contractor that also has some associated electrical work and we through the code compliance task force back in the original design of the program would designate a lead contractor on different types of projects. The way that was written up was more all projects that had multiple trade contractors without a general contractor would have a designated lead person and we used this form to guide us on who that would be for the process of assessing final fees. If the electrical contractor for instance on change outs failed several times that additional fee would be passed to the mechanical contractor because he was determined to be the lead contractor for that project that involved multiple trades. The way it was written it wasn't clear it didn't apply to all projects where you may have an electrical contractor working on a project that's totally unassociated with the work a plumber might be doing somewhere else on the project but it grouped those together and called one of those a lead contractor and that doesn't work out well when you have two contractors that are not associated with each other in the project. One may be working in the garage; one may be working in the kitchen and has nothing to do with each other. It's not like the change out or new equipment that actually has two different types of trade contractors working together on the same project. So we wanted to clarify that before we pushed this all the way to the smallest projects and indicate that on those types of projects where there are work associated between 2 trade contractors we would designate by this list who the lead responsible contractor was, in a lot of cases will be the mechanical contractor depending upon the work; water heater might be the plumbing contractor where there may be some electrical and plumbing work associated. So we will continue to use this but wanted to clarify the fact that there are projects that will have multiple trade contractors without a general contractor that

really doesn't have any association with the other type of work so they'll be handled separately and fee'd separately so if their high failure rates reflect that they need to adjust the fees up or down that will be assigned to the permit holder. The way it mostly works out for all projects is whoever pays for the permits will be the responsibility party for the adjustments. The question is, is it clear enough to what we proposed to add some language (already on the website) replace it with the revised version that clarifies that each contractor that pays for a permit is on their own and any fee adjustments would be pushed to the contractor. Jim stated the way it works is the fee ordinance references the particular document and so the document is on the web site as a publication. So to change the way we manage this from a process perspective, we just take the old one down and put the new one up.

8.3. MANAGER/CA ADDED COMMENTS

Joe Weathers: Concern surrounding the Consistency Meetings; its been trending over the last couple of years that while I'd like to think we're perfectly consistent, we are getting virtually no input from customers. We usually get things concerns from the customers, put them on the agenda and then the customers and us go over that to come up with some kind of resolution both for them and for us. The issues are almost nill and attendance is almost nill at most meetings. Do you have feedback for us as to what is going on there; are we perfectly consistent, where do we stand mainly looking at the MEP groups as Mr. Horton is having a similar problem with the mechanical/plumbing; every month it's me trying to come up with issues to make them inconsistent so that we'll have something to discuss vs. discussing actual items that are coming in from the field. Jim stated that the problem is peculiar to MEP as he sat in the last 2 consistency meetings and there is an army of residential folks typically in the first session and then a solid group that stay for the commercial session. Consistency is an issue both for our staff as well as the industry. A consistency issue can be submitted by a code official who thinks maybe two people are handling it differently because they are concerned about that; they want to make sure it's all going the say way. In the past we've had more participation and we're not certain what to do with it. We could have a discussion with Zeke, Hal and Ed as a group to see if there is anything to do differently about how we present this to the industry to get them to participate more or is this just where everybody is getting ramped back up and the issues will come back. We can set up a meeting between Joe, Willis, Zeke, Hal and Ed; Jim will facilitate the discussion.

Jeff Griffin: Regarding the recap sheet; the issue with the recap sheet is there are two columns listed, one was inspection count and the other is charged a failure. What you don't see behind this there are failures that are not chargeable that comes into the equation. It is still counting the first column as a total number of trips for inspections but because it wasn't a chargeable failure you don't see the calculation that actually pulls that out. Once we figure out the percentage; that comes right out of the fee ordinance. The break-even is zero and 15% on graduated scale in the fee ordinance.

9. Adjournment

The May 15th, 2012 Building Development Commission meeting adjourned at 4:53 p.m.

Note: The next BDC Meeting is scheduled for 3:00 p.m., Tuesday, June 17th, 2012.